In the Official Action mailed **17 July 2007** the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 21, 22, 25, and 33. Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 21, 22, 25, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1, 9, 13, 21, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Abramson et al. (USPN 6,539,494, hereinafter "Abramson"), and Sandhu et al. (USPN 6,985,953 hereinafter "Sandhu"). Claims 10, 22, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Abramson, Sandhu, and Fielder et al. (USPN 6,105,133 hereinafter "Fielder").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 13, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner averred that it was unclear how the running message digest was updated and how the state information was retrieved because the claims allegedly did not indicate that a secure communication session was set up between the client and the second server.

The Examiner suggested that the applicant amend the claims to clarify that a secure communication session is set up between the client and the second server. Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that (1) a secure communication session is established between the client and the second server (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 3-4), (2) a session identifier is associated with the secure communication session (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 4-5), and (3) the second server continually changes a running message digest (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 5-6). These claim amendments find support on page 4, lines 1-11, and on page 12, lines 14-18.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramson in view of Sandhu.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are not obvious over Abramson in view of Sandhu for at least the following reasons.

1. Abramson teaches away from sharing a secure communication session between a client and two servers without establishing a separate session with each server.

Abramson teaches establishing a new session between the client and a second application server. Specifically, Abramson teaches that the user's session data is "reconstituted into a ***newly created session***" (*see* Abramson, col. 4, lines 61-64; *see also* Abramson, Abstract, FIG. 4, step 250, FIG. 6, step 530, FIG. 9, step 825, FIG. 10, step 950).

In contrast to Abramson, the present invention is specifically directed to share a secure communication session ***without*** creating a new session because creating new sessions can "greatly degrade the scalability of the system" (*see* page 3, lines 1-2, and page 4, lines 6-9 of the instant application). The present invention doesn't have to create a new session because a server that is currently communicating with a client publishes the running message digest to a database, which can then be used by another server to send messages over the secure communication session without establishing a separate session (*see* page 9, lines 15-18, and page 12, lines 6-9 of the instant application). Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that the first server communicates with "the client through the secure communication session ***without*** establishing a separate secure communication session between the client and the first server" (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 21-24).

8

To summarize, Abramson teaches away from the present invention because Abramson teaches establishing a new session (*see* Abramson, col. 4, lines 61-64; *see also* Abramson, Abstract, FIG. 4, step 250, FIG. 6, step 530, FIG. 9, step 825, FIG. 10, step 950), which is in contrast to the present invention which shares a secure communication session ***without*** establishing a new session (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 21-24).

2. Sandhu does not disclose continually changing a running message digest as messages are sent through the secure communication session. Further, Sandhu does not disclose publishing updates to the running message digest to a database.

The Examiner cited Sandhu, col. 9, lines 11-40 as disclosing a running message digest that changes as messages pass through the secure communication session. However, the Examiner's cite only discloses using MD5 or SHA to create a message digest from the cookies. It does not disclose continually changing a running message digest as messages are sent through the secure communication session. Furthermore, the Examiner's cite also does not disclose publishing updates to the running message digest to a database.

To summarize, the Examiner's cite does not disclose: (1) a running message digest that continually changes as messages are sent through the secure communication session (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 5-6), and (2) the server publishing updates to the running message digest to a database (*see e.g.*, claim 1, lines 7-8).

Hence, independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are not obvious under § 103(a) in view of Abramson and Sandhu because: (1) Abramson teaches away from the present invention, and (2) Sandhu does not disclose a running message digest and also does not disclose publishing updates to the running message digest to a database.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claim 10, which depends from claim 1, claim 22, which depends from claim 13, and claim 33, which depends from claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims. Applicant has canceled dependent claims 9 and 21 without prejudice.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By __/Gilbert Wong/_____
    Gilbert Wong
    Reg. No. 57,990

Date: 3 October 2007

Gilbert Wong
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 204-4040
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: gilbert@parklegal.com